

Remarks

The Office Action mailed October 25, 2004, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-9, 11, 14-22, and 25-26 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-9, 11-22, and 24-26 stand rejected. Claims 10, 12, 13, 23, and 24 have been canceled.

Applicant wishes to express his appreciation for the courtesies extended to the undersigned during a telephone interview on December 23, 2004. The 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of Claims 1 and 14 were discussed. Applicant submitted proposed claim amendments to Claims 1 and 14 for the Examiner's review. The Examiner agreed the proposed claim amendments overcome the 112 rejections.

The objection to the specification is respectfully traversed. Specifically, the title has been amended to recite "BRACKET ASSEMBLY HAVING A PLURALITY OF PLATES FOR A DYNAMOELECTRIC MACHINE." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The objections to Claim 20 is respectfully traversed. Specifically, Claim 20 has been amended to recite "first and second intermediate end plates." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the objection to Claim 20 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that Claims 1-9, 11-22, and 24 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 1-9, 11-22, and 24 are definite. Specifically, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 14 to recite "a first support plate extending from said first end plate, said support member, said first intermediate plate, and a first side plate such that said first support plate forms a first enclosure...a second support plate extending from said second end plate." For at least the reasons set forth above, Claims 1 and 14 are submitted to be definite.

Furthermore, regarding Claims 8 and 21, Applicant submits that an artisan of ordinary skill in the art would understand what is meant by the first support plate 54 comprising a semi-annular plate after reading the specification in view of the current drawings. Applicant submits an artisan of ordinary skill in the art would understand the structure of first support plate 54, second support plate 62, and support member 46 after reading the specification in view of the current drawings. For example, the specification, on page 3, at lines 28 and 29, states “[s]upport member 46 defines an inner edge of first support plate 54 and second support plate 62.” Furthermore, and for example, the specification, on page 3, at line 11, states that “[s]upport member 46 is a semi-annular ring.” Applicant submits that the inner edges of first support plate 54 and second support plate 62 are defined by the semi-annular shape of support member 46. For at least the reasons set forth above, Claims 8 and 21 are submitted to be definite.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 112 rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-22, and 24 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-19, 21, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Michel et al. (US 3,114,061) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 was indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 13 has been canceled and Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations from Claim 13. Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Michel et al.

Claim 12 has been canceled. Claims 2-5, 8, 9, and 11 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-5, 8, 9, and 11 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicant submits that Claims 2-5, 8, 9, and 11 likewise are patentable over Michel et al.

Claim 13 was indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 13 has been canceled and Claim 14 has been amended to

include the recitations from Claim 13. Accordingly, Claim 14 is submitted to be patentable over Michel et al.

Claims 15-19, 21, 22, and 24 depend from independent Claim 14. When the recitations of Claims 15-19, 21, 22, and 24 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 14, Applicant submits that Claims 15-19, 21, 22, and 24 likewise are patentable over Michel et al.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-19, 21, 22, and 24 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 6, 7, 20, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michel et al. in view of Pezzillo (US 2,312,848) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 was indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 13 has been canceled and Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations from Claim 13. Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Michel et al. in view of Pezzillo.


Claims 6, 7, and 25 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 6, 7, and 25 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicant submits that Claims 6, 7, and 25 likewise are patentable over Michel et al. in view of Pezzillo.

Claim 13 was indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 13 has been canceled and Claim 14 has been amended to include the recitations from Claim 13. Accordingly, Claim 14 is submitted to be patentable over Michel et al. in view of Pezzillo.

Claims 20 and 26 depend from independent Claim 14. When the recitations of Claims 20 and 26 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 14, Applicant submits that Claims 20 and 26 likewise are patentable over Michel et al. in view of Pezzillo.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patrick W. Rasche", written over a horizontal line.

Patrick W. Rasche
Registration No. 37,916
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070